



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

On
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,742	09/05/2003	James M. Piatt	550299.93333	9082
26710	7590	09/16/2004	EXAMINER	
QUARLES & BRADY LLP			PHILLIPS, CHARLES E	
411 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE				
SUITE 2040			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-4497			3751	

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

YW

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/656,742	PIATT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles E. Phillips	3751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5,6 and 19-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-17 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 18 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/13/03.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: ____.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Clow.

The sink here has a first work surface "a" "surrounded by a wall and the drain opening can be seen in Fig. 3. The "platform" is seen as "b" "and is shown attached by screws.

The claim 7 "plurality of supports" is structure "b" and "c"; these as well can be considered "legs" for claim 8.

Re: claim 18, the surface of Clow, is convex at least at its edge.

Claims 1, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by De Bie.

See the convex work surface 23 of Fig. 1. The conventional sink faucet would meet claim 10.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clow as applied supra, in view of Hennessy.

To provide for the sink environment of the former to employ a laminar flow spout 175' as taught by the sink environment of the latter would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan as the use of one sink spout in the environment of another sink would have been *per se* obvious.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clow as applied *supra* in view of Bogusz.

To employ Bogusz on any portion of the sink surface of Clow would have been obvious as same is taught for use with a sink.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Fig. 2, Fig. 10 and Fig. 12.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims

are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Haas on 8/17/04 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Fig. 12, claims 1-4, and 7-18. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 5, 6, and 19-24 stand withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

It is noted that in said conversation that Mr. Haas indicated that claims 19 read on Fig. 12; however, this is not the case as no "tough" is present in Fig. 12.

Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Hill shows a sink accessory.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Charles E. Phillips at telephone number 308-1515.


Charles E. Phillips
Primary Examiner